DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 463 SP 017 454

AUTHOR Edelfelt, Roy A.
TITLE Inservice Education: Criteria for Local Programs.
INSTITUTION Western Washington Univ., Bellingham.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 76
GRANT 489AH60390
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Decision Making; Educational Resources; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Improvement; *Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; Professional Development; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Rewards; Standards; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Promotion

ABSTRACT

Criteria suggesting standards and characteristics for inservice education programs are described. In an introductory table, the purposes of inservice education are illustrated. They include advanced degrees, school improvement, professional advancement, retraining for new assignments, and personal professional development. The process, setting, authority, responsible agency, reward structure, and motivation for each of these purposes are listed. Inservice program criteria are grouped into five sections: decision making, relationship to the program of the school, resources, commitment to teacher education, and rewards. The criteria may be used in several ways. They may provide basic ideas upon which professionals can plan and operate a program. They may also be used as survey items to obtain perceptions of district or school personnel, to provide information on current circumstances and what might be desirable in an inservice education program, and to examine the priorities of those involved in program development. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205463

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul Walker -- Far West Teacher Corps Network

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INSERVICE EDUCATION: CRITERIA FOR LOCAL PROGRAMS

This pamphlet was produced by the Far West Teacher Corps Network under a grant from the United States Office of Education. The materials were

prepared under Grant #489AH60390 to Western Washington State College from the United States Office of Education. The opinions expressed

herein should not necessarily be construed as representing the opinions of the United States Office of Education.

Printed by Western Washington State College Press, Bellingham, Washington. 1976

Farwest Teacher Corps Network

SP017454

Library of Congress catalogue no. 76-54480

Preface

This document is a brief version of a more comprehensive publication, one dealing with 29 criteria for designing local inservice programs and offering illustrations of the criteria in operation. Here the focus is on the 29 criteria alone, discussing their meaning and application. It is intended to be a handy reference that can be reproduced and distributed locally at modest cost.

These criteria were not discovered intuitively or devised by one or two experts in isolation. They grew out of guidelines in question form that were generated from a Teacher-Corps-sponsored Workshop on Reconceptualizing Inservice Education in Atlanta in February 1975 and were published in **Rethinking In-Service Education.** Following the Atlanta workshop, criteria were developed from those questions and shared widely by the Far West Teacher Corps Network for reactions with teachers, administrators, higher education personnel, state department of education officials, teacher organization leaders and staff, and others. Finally, the criteria were considered by teams of educators (again including teachers, administrators, state department of education staff, college and university personnel, teacher organization staff, and Teacher Corps directors) at a two-and-a-half day workshop sponsored by the Far West Teacher Corps Network in Las Vegas in June 1976.

The reactions and recommendations of all these people were pulled together and refined with additional commentary and explanation by Roy Edelfelt.

We publish these criteria as ideas to consider, not as pronouncements to heed. In the best of all possible worlds, all of these criteria could be applied. In our yet imperfect state, readers must choose those criteria that are possible, feasible, and reasonable for their situation.

A special note of recognition is deserved by Teacher Corps, Washington, D.C. and the Board of Directors of the Far West Teacher Corps Network for their vision and continuing efforts to upgrade in-service education.

Paul (Randy) Walker
Executive Secretary
Far West Teacher Corps Network
September 1976

Criteria for Local Inservice Education Programs

Roy A. Edelfelt

"What criteria should guide inservice education at the local level?" This question is heard all across the country these days from teachers, administrators, school board members, college professors, and others.

Criteria are more helpful than prescriptions to educators who want to design their own inservice education program. Criteria do not dictate the substance and the essence of program; they suggest standards and characteristics. They also set forth principles for decisions about the conditions and circumstances of planning and operation.

As Table 1 illustrates, inservice education has many distinct purposes. The purpose for which these criteria are mainly intended is school improvement. But purposes do overlap. Inservice education for school improvement may be study for which credit is earned, and it may lead to a credential, a degree, or other academic recognition. Categories of inservice education are never pure, and purposes are seldom singular (Joyce, Howey, & Yarger, 1976). Consequently, adaptations should be made in definition, purpose, and criteria appropriate to particular school systems and buildings. However, for the criteria included in this booklet the major focus is consistent with the following definition: Inservice education is "a program of activities promoted or directed by an educational organization [and] designed to increase the competencies needed by K-12 personnel in the performance of their duties" (State of Washington, 1976, p.2).

Criteria are grouped into five sections: Decision-Making, Relationship to the Program of the School, Resources, Commitment to Teacher Education, and Rewards. The discussion following each criterion attempts to make meaning more clear and to address some issues the criterion raises. All criteria are interrelated and interdependent; that is, each one influences all the others and the 29 represent a total concept of inservice education for the improvement of school program.

The criteria may be used in several ways. They are probably of most value as considerations that any school faculty might review in thinking through ground rules for designing and

4 *This paper is for thought and discussion. It does not represent the policy or opinion of any organization or agency.*

TABLE 1

Purposes of Inservice Education

Purpose	Process	Setting	Legal Sanction and/or Administrative Authority	Responsible Agency and/or Standard of Control	Rewards	Motivation
Degrees, credentials, licensure	Formal college or university study	College or university campus, extension centers	State Law, state board policy, state dept. regs. and/or state professional licensure commission regs.	State board policy, state dept. regs, or state professional licensure commission standards	Degree, credential, license, and/or better job opportunities	Legal and professional requirement
School improvement	Workshops, local seminars, and/or analysis of professional practice with help	School district, teacher center, professional development center, training complex, school building, teaching station	Local school board policy and/or special state or federal legislation	School district policy and/or collective-bargaining contract	Improved school program, personal satisfaction, parent satisfaction, student satisfaction, or salary increment	School board, and/or district requirement, and/or collective-bargaining contract
Professional advancement or promotion	Formal and informal study of teaching, administration, counseling, etc.	College or university campus, extension center, teacher center, professional development center	School district policy and/or state law or regulation	School district criteria and/or state certification requirements	Qualification for better position, and/or employment in better position	Requirements set by local and/or state agency
Retraining for new assignment	Courses, workshops, institutes, and/or special training in new level or subject (e.g., handicapped, early childhood)	College or university campus, school district	School district policy and/or state law or regulation	School district criteria and/or state certification requirements	Qualification for new position and/or employment in new position	Requirements determined by job and/or state certification regulations
Personal Professional development	Choice of individual teacher	Setting appropriate to choice	Personal but also recognized by others None; but personal standards and peer pressure influence development	Personal/professional standards	New knowledge, improved competence, and/or self-satisfaction	Personal desire or commitment

determining program. The criteria provide basic ideas on which professionals can plan and operate a program.

Another, very different use of the criteria is as survey items to get a reading of the perceptions of district or building personnel. A survey can provide a fairly quick and efficient starting point. It will tell what respondents think of current circumstances, what they think desirable in inservice education, and the priority they place on each of the criteria. A survey instrument can be constructed as follows:

Inservice Education Planning Survey

Instructions: For each statement on the left, circle the responses in columns A,B, and C that reflect your perceptions. In columns A and B, 1 = Never or almost never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Frequently, and 4 = Always. In column C, 1 = Of little importance, 10 = Of great importance, and the numbers 2-9 represent gradations between these extremes.

	A What Is	B What Should Be	C Importance of Item as a Criterion
1. Decision-making processes are based on co-operation between all major interest groups (school district, college /University, teacher organization).	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Asking respondents to indicate both "What is" and What Should Be" makes it possible to assess the distance between these points — that is, the discrepancy between circumstances that exist and the aspirations of respondents. Tallying the third column gives an indication of the degree to which personnel think particular criteria are important. Looking at both the mean discrepancy and the mean level of agreement of all respondents

provides information on the direction in which respondents want to move and the priority that they assign to such a move.

Decision-Making

There are six criteria that deal with aspects of decision-making. The process of decision-making is a first consideration because it sets the tone of collective action and specifies how people will be regarded.

1. **Decision-making processes are based on cooperation between all major interest groups, that is, school district, college/university, and teacher organization.**

It may be instructive to explain why "cooperation" is used rather than "collaboration," the latter term enjoying considerable use in inservice education. Cooperation was chosen because the meaning of the word is more appropriate. It means "the action of cooperating: common effort" (Webster's, 1974, p. 250) and "association of persons for common benefit" whereas collaboration means working "jointly with others esp. in an intellectual endeavor" (p. 219).

Obviously cooperation is a first condition. Unless the major interest groups work and act together for common benefit, there can be little progress on inservice education. However, cooperation should not suggest that there will not be conflict. Conflict may, in fact, be productive — provided it is dealt with in ways that find resolution and accommodation to different points of view or that result in compromise or the synthesis of various persuasions into new and better ideas.

School districts, colleges/universities, and teacher organizitions admittedly have different views on some issues. Each organization exists for different reasons. When they come together to cooperate on inservice education, it is inevitable that differences will become evident. One such difference may be the criteria to which each can subscribe for inservice education programs. Thus, a first order of business may be to examine the criteria that follow, to assess the level of agreement, and to select or develop criteria on which inservice education programs can be planned and operated.

2. **Decisions are made by the people who are affected, and the decisions are made as close as possible to the situation where they will be operative.**

Obviously decision-making for the design of local programs should be locally based. But how locally based? Should authority be delegated to on-site staff? What decisions should be made at the building level? Who should be involved, in addition to major interest groups? What part should parents and students play? What part should the state department of education play?

The argument for building-level decision-making is that it involves the people who are most immediately responsible for improving school program. And there is some evidence that the school building is the largest viable unit for change and improvement. Current arguments for more decentralization support this notion.

Inservice education must also have school district sanction and support. Thus, some decision-making should take place at that level. Such decisions most appropriately deal with facilitating and coordinating inservice programs at the building level and attending to those elements of program that are district-wide.

Additionally, education is the responsibility of the state, so some decisions will be made by state departments and state boards of education. (For a discussion of decisions that are appropriately made at this level, see Edelfelt & Allen, 1967, and Edelfelt & Johnson, 1975, particularly pp. 38-55, 80-82).

The above paragraphs address different levels of decision-making. At each level, criterion #1 holds — that there is cooperation which includes at least the school district, college/university, and teacher organization. There may be — in some cases there ought to be — established committees or the like to make the necessary decisions.

Some provision for parent and student involvement is also essential. However, neither group has sufficient professional expertise to be a full partner. Input from parents and students is probably most effective at the building level, where they can react directly to issues that affect them. Certainly the participation of parents and students is necessary if clients are to be heard. Involving parents and students also helps to communicate how difficult inservice education and school improvement are.

3. **The cooperation of major interest groups is based on a concept of parity for each party.**

To understand this criterion it is most important to be clear on a definition of parity. Parity is used here to mean "the quality or state of being equal or equivalent" (Webster's, 1974, p. 833). Representatives of major interest groups, then, should be equal

in the weight of their opinion on an issue in question. Parity is probably most clear in voting, each party having equal weight in any vote.

Equality will probably not exist in degree of expertise, length of experience, or competence in particular areas. For a discussion of this issue, see criterion #26.

4. **Explicit procedures exist to assure fairness in decision-making.**

This criterion goes beyond ensuring equality or parity. It calls for procedures that guarantee justice, impartiality, dispassion, and objectivity. It means that there should be procedures to guard against exploitation of one interest group by the others.

Explicit procedures might include required consensus for major decisions, veto powers in voting, specified procedures for due process, an appeal procedure, and/or binding arbitration.

5. **There are policies (e.g., in a collective-bargaining agreement) relating to inservice education.**

A "policy" is "a definite course or method of action selected. . . to guide and determine present and future decisions" (Webster's, 1974, p. 890). "Policies" here refers to school district policies, of which the collective-bargaining agreement is an example.

Teacher organizations are seeking to have many matters relating to inservice education included in collective-bargaining contracts. However, there are procedures and processes in most school districts that go beyond topics covered in collective-bargaining contracts. Therefore, the term "policies" is used to assure that all matters dealing with inservice education are encompassed.

6. **Inservice education programs are institutionalized.**

This criterion means that inservice education is an established part of the system and a significant practice within the school organization. It also suggests that worthy new programs will become part of the system.

In many school districts, inservice education is not an integral part of the school system. The school district has traditionally seen its primary goal as educating the young. Too often it has seen that goal as its sole obligation, not recognizing any responsibility for the inservice eudcation of teachers. Gradually, however, school districts are accepting some responsibility for inservice education because they recognize its influence in improving school program.

Relationship to the Program of the School

Two provisos should be made explicit regarding the criteria in this and other sections. One is that the first five criteria below are not mutually exclusive; that is, inservice education can be directly related to curriculum development and can also improve instruction and meet the needs of students, teachers, and school program. Second, some of the criteria in this section may seem similar to criteria that appear under other headings; for example, criterion #12 in this section may seem similar to criterion #16 in the section on "Resources." Not so. This section is concerned about how inservice education is provided for within the school program; the "Resources" section is concerned about whether the resource, time, is available to engage in inservice education.

7. **Inservice education is directly related to curriculum development.**

Certainly, "curriculum" must be defined for this criterion to have meaning. Among the broadest definitions is "all the learning experiences for which the school is responsible." A bit more limited is "all of the planned learning outcomes for which the school is responsible." Obviously, those who use these criteria will need to agree on their own definition.

Another way to be precise in definition is to apply this criterion to the curriculum at the building level; that is, to state the criterion, "Inservice education is directly related to curriculum development at the building level."

8. **Inservice education is directly related to instructional improvement.**

There is general agreement that instructional improvement is the central and compelling reason for inservice education. This is probably the most noncontroversial criterion.

There are, of course, other purposes for inservice education, some of which are stated in the next three criteria. An important issue is establishing a proper balance among purposes and being explicit and public about priorities.

9. **Inservice education is based on the needs of students.**

In fact, inservice education may be only indirectly based on the needs of students because teachers' problems as influenced by

students may be the main emphasis of inservice education. For example, attention to teachers' skills in classroom management may be the result of student behavior problems. This criterion is intended to suggest that inservice education of teachers will have outcomes that contribute to meeting the needs of students. This criterion should help keep inservice education relevant.

There are types of inservice education that are not related to the needs of students. This criterion does not suggest that such inservice education is unjustified or unimportant. The critical issue is finding the appropriate balance between inservice programs that help teachers respond more adequately to student needs and inservice programs with other goals.

10. **Inservice education is based on the needs of teachers.**

Teachers strongly concur with this criterion, particularly when it means the needs of teachers as perceived by teachers. Traditionally, inservice education has been prescribed for teachers by others. Psychology supports the notion that learning is optimum when what is learned satisfies the needs of the learner.

There is also research evidence that teacher involvement is crucial in change projects if success is to be expected (Greenwood, Mann, & McLaughlin, 1975). If a central purpose of inservice education is school improvement, teachers must be involved.

There are other views on this criterion. College and university people, who have long dominated formal inservice education through graduate study, argue that they have the knowledge and expertise to determine what teachers ought to know. School district administrators, curriculum directors, and supervisors argue that teachers' perceived needs are but one important determinant of inservice education; they suggest that inservice education should also be compatible with district supervision/evaluation standards. Advocates of competency-based inservice programs argue that teacher needs should be determined in relation to needed teacher competencies.

This criterion may be one that requires considerable discussion.

10. Inservice education is based on the needs of school program.

In order to base inservice education on the needs of school program, the school's goals must be clear and public, and there must be consensus on their importance and validity. It is unusual to have both those conditions in force. However, inservice

education that is intended to satisfy the needs of school program might be an effective device to get clear, common understandings and agreements on school goals and purposes. That approach, of course, is usually much more feasible if the school program in question is the building program over which teachers and administrators have some control.

If it is to work for the program of the building, inservice education should include the principal and all other participating personnel (see criterion #28).

12. **Inservice education is a part of a teacher's regular teaching load.**

This criterion is probably the most significant of all because it proposes a new concept of the job of teaching. It suggests **more than** "released time" or "Tuesdays for thinking." It affirms that study, exploration, development, and learning are integral parts of professional practice and should be a legitimate part of the teacher's regular responsibilities.

Note that the inservice education under discussion here is that related to the improvement of school program — inservice education that responds to student, teacher, and program needs. There are, of course, other types of inservice education that teachers will engage in for their own purposes — for example, to attain additional credentials and degrees or to gain additional knowledge and skill in teacher organization matters. (See chart 1)

13. **The techniques and methods used in inservice education are consistent with fundamental principles of good teaching and learning.**

This criterion does not suggest that adult learning is identical with child and adolescent learning. It suggests that learning at any level is essentially the same process and that good principles of teaching are universal. It recommends that approaches to teaching and learning used in inservice education illustrate the best professional practice.

Approaches (techniques and methods) and the expectations for learning should be made public (see Corwin & Edelfelt, 1976, pp. 8-9).

14. **Research/evaluation is an integral part of inservice education.**

Monitoring that provides for feedback, and evaluation coupled with research are integral parts of inservice education. Data should be gathered to establish goals and objectives, to make decisions about content and procedures, and to assess the

degree to which goals and objectives are achieved in an inservice program.

Inservice education should also use and reflect research findings and promote more systematic and scientific approaches to collecting and treating data in teaching.

Outside talents should be employed when necessary to assist teachers and others in designing research and evaluation schemes. Teachers should determine what is to be evaluated; researchers can provide the technical assistance to make results as reliable and sophisticated as possible.

15. **All those who participate in inservice education are engaged in both learning and teaching.**

Inservice education is not merely a matter of one group dispensing information to another; each participant has some special area of insight, talent, expertise, and perception. Included in "all those who participate" are teachers, college professors, school administrators and supervisors, curriculum directors, etc. All these participants at one time or another will be engaged as learners and teachers.

Resources

16. **Time is available during regular instructional hours for inservice education.**

Time in a teacher's working day is a very precious commodity. There is never enough. Providing time for inservice education during regular instructional hours requires some changes in both scheduling and attitudes. Attitudes may be the most difficult to change. Some teachers and administrators do not think that a teacher is at work unless he or she is engaged in teaching students. Studying diagnostic procedures while trying to analyze learning problems of students, or developing a curriculum unit to fit a particular group or individual student and studying curriculum theory in the process — these seldom register as legitimate teacher activities on school time.

Schedules will also be difficult to change, particularly if student-teacher ratios remain as high as in recent years and if all students must constantly be in classes or supervised by teachers.

The subject of time to teach has had some study (Provus & Jacobson, 1966), but the subject of time for teachers to learn has had practically no attention.

17. **Adequate personnel are available from the school district and college/university for inservice education.**

"Adequate" means sufficient in both quality and quantity. "Personnel . . . from the school district" includes teachers. Practicing classroom teachers are at times the best instructors for other teachers.

Mentioning only school district and higher education may be too restrictive. Other resources exist in the regional education laboratories, state departments of education, boards of cooperative educational services, intermediate school districts, teacher organizations, administrator organizations, etc. Personnel from all these agencies should be available when appropriate.

18. **Adequate materials are available.**

Again, "adequate" means quality as well as quantity. Sometimes quality materials are available, but not in sufficient quantity. This is particularly true with books and audivisual materials; the wait to use a particular item can be so long that the relevant moment has passed when the item becomes available.

Access to materials is another problem. Some insntructional materials centers and teacher centers provide both excellent access and excellent consultant help in selection and use. Too often, however, teachers are left to the time-consuming job of seeking out for themselves the material they need, and they get no counsel on its use.

19. **Inservice education makes use of community resources.**

Despite field trips, catalogs of community resources, business education days, etc., most schools make relatively little use of the people, places, and things available in the immediate environment of the school. Inservice education should help teachers become aware of, conversant with, and skilled in the use of community resources.

With all instructional resources, particularly those outside the school, there should be a clearinghouse to match them with teacher needs.

20. **Funds for inservice education are provided by the local school district.**

The source of funds (local, state, or federal) that local districts use to pay for inservice education is still a debatable issue. The local districts' obligation to provide funds is less controversial, particularly among teachers. They contend that the major benefit of inservice education designed to improve instruction accrues to

students and the community, and thus, this kind of inservice education should be at public expense.

Property taxes in most communities are already viewed as excessive. Inservice education should probably be largely financed by state funds that are earmarked for that purpose and disbursed to districts with approved programs. Federal funds should also be available to support inservice education. However, they should be transmitted through the state.

There are recommendations that inservice education be paid for by regional educational agencies. Some contend that institutions of higher education, teacher organizations, and individuals should pay the bill. The purposes and the benefactors of inservice education should be considered in making decisions about who has fiscal responsibility. The main goal is assuring that funding for inservice educaton is provided on a continuous basis so that programs cease to be piecemeal and haphazard, and so that inservice education will not be the first cut when budgets must be pared.

21. **Inservice education is paid for by state funds provided for that purpose.**

Maintaining adequate schools and quality personnel to staff them is primarily a state responsibility. States have accepted this responsibility, but in maintaining the quality of school personnel the main emphasis has been the initial preparation of teachers. It is time for state officials to recognize and accept responsibility for inservice education. In a society that is changing rapidly, preservice teacher education can never be adequate for a career in teaching. Clearly, some areas of teacher competence are better learned in practice. Inequities in funding among local districts can be compensated for by state funding, and monitoring to ensure quality can be achieved with greater objectivity by a disinterested agency of the state.

Funding and other aspects of support require state legal sanctions (see Edelfelt & Johnson, 1975, p 80-82). Such sanctions would institutionalize and legitimize the organization, design, concept, and support of inservice education. No states now have sanctions adequate to that task (Giffert, Harper, & Schember, 1976).

Some contend that funding must be shared by decision-making groups (see criterion #1 and #2) or else parity will fail. The counterargument is that some of the major interest groups (e.g., institutions of higher education and teacher organizations) have no direct responsibility for education in public schools and no

sources of funds that could legitimately be spent on inservice education to improve school program.

Commitment to Teacher Education

22. **Professional growth is seen as a continuum from preservice preparation through career-long professional development.**

Learning to teach and maintaining competence to teach is a continuous, never-ending process. However, there are checkpoints at which judgments are made about meeting requirements for graduation, certification, and tenure. Unfortunately, these checkpoints have separated professional growth into segments. For example, undergraduate preparation is seldom connected smoothly with initial practice and the beginning of inservice education. There is typically no recognized transition period. A college senior abruptly becomes a 10th-grade English teacher between June and September.

The criterion means that professional growth is a continuous process, not only in the mind of the individual professional, but also in the formal provisions made for professional growth. Preservice preparation provides a substantial beginning toward a holistic concept of a professional teacher, and inservice education continues development within the framework of that concept. Teaching competence, then, is developed and honed in a constant and conscious effort to make professional improvement a career-long process.

23. **The inservice education program reflects the many different ways that professionals grow.**

This criterion is concerned with the response of the system of inservice education to the individual. It is intended to remind planners that growth patterns differ in style, timing, and interests. Individual teaching style can be promoted by fostering individual learning style.

Many options should be open to teachers in inservice education, even options that lead to similar goals. For example, one teacher might seek to improve his or her effectiveness in teaching reading by taking a course, another by observing in selected schools, a third by working in a clinic, and a fourth by working closely with a supervisor or advisor in analyzing practice. All these options are constructive and viable and should be legitimate.

A teacher's first step in employing this criterion might be

self-evaluation to identify his or her uniqueness and peculiarities. An important provision is having someone competent and compatible to give counsel. School districts might well consider the British advisor system (see Tyrell, 1964) or some other way to provide teachers with counselors who are not threatening and who have no authority over teachers.

24. **The inservice education program addresses the many different roles and responsibilities that a teacher must assume.**

Another way to state this criterion is, the inservice education program addresses the many different functions of a teacher.

All teacher education is focused primarily on the role of teacher of students. The emphasis is on the teacher's encounter with the student(s). Yet teachers spend an important part of their time planning curriculum, devising instructional strategy, and developing evaluation schemes. They also function as a member of a faculty, a liaison with parents, a member of a profession, etc. Inservice education should include study, analysis, and interpretation of the problems and issues connected with all these roles and help teachers develop competence in each of them.

25. **Inservice education is related to research and development.**

Inservice education should always have an experimental edge, particularly now when interest in inservice education has been aroused and there is an acute need for more effective programs.

Inservice education designed for school improvement should be especially amenable to research and development. That emphasis brings curriculum development and instructional improvement to the fore as the substance of inservice education. How actual practice and program interface with professional development must be documented by research.

College and university faculty, as well as teachers, will find this emphasis of inservice education a very fertile field for research. There is interest at thousands of schools.

Usually college and university staff members are not well rewarded for working at school sites. However, the combination of assistance with inservice education and research on new developments can legitimize assignments in public schools for higher education professors.

26. **The respective strengths of the school district, the college/university, the teacher organization, and the community are used in the inservice education program.**

This criterion is difficult to achieve because none of these groups has inservice education as its primary mission. Who will coordinate the use of strengths? How can the different competencies of the groups be used most effectively? Obviously a process must be developed, ideally one that reflects the criteria in the first section (on decision-making).

There may be apprehensions about one group dominating. Certainly, special strengths will make a particular agency preeminent at times. For example, if the focus of inservice education is school improvement, the school district has a singular strength in teachers and other personnel who know students and existing programs. The school faculty, then, is preeminent in its knowledge and awareness of the people and circumstances that are affected. Faculty members should have the major voice in decisions about inservice education that is designed to improve school program. On the other hand, university and state department of education personnel may be more knowledgeable about certain content and techniques that will contribute to school program improvement. They can serve effectively as consultants, guides, and counselors. Still different is the teacher organization with its acute awareness of teacher needs, for example, in regard to conditions of work or teacher involvement in decision-making. These concerns are best expressed through the organization as the collective agent of the teachers. By contrast, if the focus is a research project, or dissemination of research findings, the university might have the greatest competence and be a primary force.

The respective strengths of different groups, then, differentiate their roles in various activities. However, one of the confounding problems of our times is whether cooperating groups can decide when the preeminence of one group, the expertise of another group, or democratic decision-making should prevail — or, how to make them coexist. The whole issue needs more discussion than can be provided here. Writings by Denemark and Yff (1974), Darland (undated), and Hosam, Corrigan, Denemark, and Nash (1976) may help to clarify the issues in local discussions.

27. **Internship and student teaching experiences are used for analysis and study in the inservice education program.**

Internship and student teaching experiences (clinical or laboratory experiences) provide unique opportunities for analysis and evaluation. Analysis and evaluation are usually more open and candid because the neophyte is still in training and expects to be under rigorous scrutiny. The situation provides an

opportunity for regular teachers and teacher trainers to probe questions of teaching more deeply than is usually possible when a regular member of the staff is expected to use his or her own teaching as the subject of analysis. Yet the lessons learned can be applied by the regular teacher who supervises analysis and study. In fact, the regular teacher often learns the lesson better than the neophyte because the regular teacher has had more experience.

This criterion supports criterion #22, which deals with professional growth as a continuum, but here the emphasis is on what the mature teacher can learn from the analysis of teaching with the neophyte.

28. **Inservice education is available to all professional and nonprofessional personnel.**

The people who work in a school building — teachers, administrators, supervisors, secretaries, aides, janitors, custodians, nurses, groundskeepers, etc. — all influence the program of that school. If inservice education is to improve school program, it must include all personnel in appropriate ways.

Rewards

29. **There is a reward system for teachers, administrators, and college/university personnel and others who engage in inservice education programs.**

The rewards for inservice education have been primarily economic benefits and additional credentials. These are essential rewards. But there are others, some of which, like approbation and recognition, are very simple. It should also be possible to earn additional freedom, new privileges, higher status, and greater prestige. Ironically, more responsibility can also be a reward.

All of these rewards are largely extrinsic. Intrinsic rewards should be promoted too. In a sense, status and prestige are intrinsic because they must be earned; they can seldom be bestowed. Pride is certainly largely an intrinsic reward. So is increased self-esteem because of greater competence gained through inservice education.

Whether extrinsic or intrinsic, rewards to all who participate in inservice education should be much more clear and precise.

References

Corwin, R.G., & Edelfelt, R.A. *Perspectives on organizations: Viewpoints for teachers.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association of Teacher Educators, 1976.

Darland, D.D. Preparation in the governance of the profession. In B.O. Smith (Ed.), *Teachers for the real world.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, undated. pp. 135-149.

Denemark, G.W., & Yff, J. *Obligation for reform: The final report of the Higher Education Task Force on Improvement and Reform in American Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Edelfelt, R.A. Inservice education: Alive with interest, fraught with problems. *Inservice* (Newsletter of the National Council of States on Inservice Education), Vol. 1, No. 2, September 1976, pp. 2-3, 9.

Edelfelt, R.A., & Allen, W.C. (Eds.). *The Seattle Conference: The role of the state department of education in teacher education.* Olympia, Wash.: State of Washington, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967.

Edelfelt, R.A., & Johnson, M. (Eds.). *Rethinking in-service education.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Giffert, H.N., Harper, R.J., II, & Schember, D.M. *State legislation affecting inservice staff development in public education.* Washington, D.C.: Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 1976.

Greenwood, P.W., Mann, D., & McLaughlin, M.W. *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. III: The process of change.* (Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. R-15898/3-HEW). Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation, 1975.

Howsam, R.B., Corrigan, D.C., Denemark, G.W., & Nash, R.J. *Educating a profession: Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Joyce, B.R., Howey, K.R., & Yarger, S.J. *Issues to face.* (Inservice Teacher Education Report No. 1) Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976

Provus, M.M., & Jacobson, S. *Time to teach: Action report.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers, 1966.

Tyrell, B. *A guide to English Schools.* London: Penguin Books, 1964.

Washington, State of, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Division of Professional Services. *Action plan alternative for state support of inservice education: A concept paper.* Olympia, Wash.: Author, 1976.

Webster's new collegiate dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G.& C. Merriam Co., 1974.